



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/800,664	03/08/2001	Ho Soo Lee	YOR920010159US2	4845
30743 7590 08/19/2008 WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON & COOK, P.C. 11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD SUITE 340 RESTON, VA 20190				
EXAMINER BORLINGHAUS, JASON M				
ART UNIT 3693		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 08/19/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/800,664

Applicant(s)

LEE ET AL.

Examiner

JASON M. BORLINGHAUS

Art Unit

3693

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/27/08 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 14 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 states that a bid line corresponds to a bid. Claim 14 claims "displaying a count of bid lines associated with the at least one bid." As a bid line corresponds to one bid, how can a count of bid lines (i.e. a plurality of bid lines) be associated with a bid?

Claim 15 claims "displaying the counted number of bid lines in the graphical visual interface." Examiner assumes that the Applicant means that the bid lines that have been counted are displayed. Or does Applicant intend that just a number is displayed?

Claim 27 suffers from the same problem.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1 and 3 - 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aycock (US Patent 5,765,138) in view of Light (US Patent 5,831,631), Jones (Jones, Everett Gerald. *How to Lie with Charts*. iUniverse. February 2000. pp. 62 – 67, 70 – 71, 85 – 87, 170, 175, 258 and 262) and Friesen (US Patent 6,993,504).

Regarding Claim 19, Aycock discloses a method of purchasing products and services over a network comprising the steps of:

- submitting a Request for Quotation (RFQ) with a plurality of attributes (vendor qualifications) over the network. (see col. 1, line 10 - col. 2, line 35);
- receiving a plurality of bids in response to the RFQ over the network, each of the plurality of bids having values for each of said plurality of attributes (requirements). (see col. 3, lines 23 - 35); and
- each of said plurality of bids being responsive to said RFQ. (see col. 1, line 10 – col. 2, line 35).

Aycock does not teach a method comprising the steps of creating a graphical visual interface based on a coordinate system having a plurality of equidistant, parallel axes with a separate one of the plurality of attributes identified with each respective one of the plurality of equidistant, parallel axes, and for each of said plurality of attributes there is a point along said respective parallel axis which reflects a corresponding attribute value for a respective attribute of each corresponding one of said 1plurality of bids, and where each of said plurality of bids is identified by a bid line which connects said plurality of corresponding attribute values for each corresponding bid, whereby the graphical user interface shows a relationship in a graphical format between attribute values of different attributes of different bids of said plurality of bids in a single display, tagging at least one bid line of the bid lines, wherein the tagged at least one bid line remains displayed on the graphical visual interface after a selected filtering operation.

Jones discloses a method comprising the steps of:

- creating a graphical visual interface (radar chart) having a plurality of axes with a separate one of the plurality of attributes (criteria) identified with each respective one of the plurality of axes. (see 85 - 87); and
- for each of said plurality of attributes (criteria) there is a point along said respective axis which reflects a corresponding attribute value (numeric value) for a respective attribute (criteria) of each corresponding one of said plurality of data sets. (see pp. 85 – 87); and

- where each of said plurality of data sets is identified by a line (line plot) which connects said plurality of corresponding attribute values (numeric values) for each corresponding data set. (see pp. 85 – 87); and
- whereby the graphical user interface (radar chart) shows a relationship in a graphical format between attribute values (numeric values) of different attributes (criteria) of different data sets of said plurality of data sets in a single display. (see pp. 85 – 87, especially fig. 5.4).

Light discloses a method comprising the steps of:

- creating a graphical visual interface (iconic graph) having a plurality of equidistant, parallel axes with a separate one of the plurality of attributes (metrics) identified with each respective one of the plurality of equidistant, parallel axes. (see fig. 5; col. 7, lines 29 – 35); and
- for each of said plurality of attributes (metrics) there is a point along said respective parallel axis (top of axis) which reflects a corresponding attribute (metric) value for a respective attribute (metric); (see fig. 5; col. 7, lines 29 – 35).

Friesen discloses a method comprising the steps of:

- tagging (highlighting) at least one bid line (book axis) of the bid lines (book axes), wherein the tagged (highlighted) at least one bid line (book axis) remains displayed on the graphical visual interface after a selected filtering operation. (see col. 23, lines 40 -60).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aycock by incorporating graphing capabilities, as disclosed by Light and Jones, allowing for graphical communication of RFQ attribute information, as disclosed by Aycock.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aycock, Light and Jones by incorporating the filtration of information, as disclosed by Friesen, allowing for retrieval of the most pertinent information for the user.

Regarding Claim 20, Aycock does not teach a method further comprising the steps of untagging the at least one bid line; and removing the untagged at least one bid line from the graphical visual interface in response to the selected filtering operation.

Friesen disclose a method further comprising the steps of untagging (unhighlighting) at least one bid line (book axis) in response to the selected filtering option. (see col. 23, lines 40 - 60).

Friesen does not explicitly state the removal of the untagged at least one bid line from the graphical user interface, although Friesen does disclose the interface can be configured to bid lines (book axes) for specific companies. (see col. 24, lines 11 – 13).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aycock, Light, Jones and Friesen by incorporating the ability to remove irrelevant information, as disclosed by Friesen, allowing for the interface to show only the most pertinent information for the user.

Regarding Claim 21, Aycock does not teach a method further comprising the step of providing information pertinent to the tagged at least one bid line.

Light discloses a method further comprising the step of providing information (table) pertinent to the tagged at least one bid line (on the iconic graph). (see fig. 5; col 7, lines 29 – 35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aycock, Light, Jones and Friesen by incorporating display capabilities, as disclosed by Light, allowing for display of pertinent information for the user.

Regarding Claim 1, such claim recites substantially similar limitations as claimed in previously rejected claims. Such claim limitations are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as previously utilized.

Regarding Claim 3, Aycock discloses a method wherein the information is one of a general information (maturity level) and detailed information (on-site audit) related to at least one bid of said plurality of bids. (see abstract).

Regarding Claims 4 - 10, Aycock does not teach a method further comprising selecting a portion of a bid line; and retrieving the general or detailed information from a database, the general or detailed information being pertinent to the bid line; wherein the retrieved general information is provided in a window adjacent the bid line; creating a display separate from the graphical visual interface; and displaying the detailed information in the separate display; wherein the detailed information is rendered in one

of text, image, audio, sound, video, graphs and animation; nor wherein the information is attribute information associated with one bid line;.

Light discloses a method further comprising:

- selecting a portion of a bid line (iconic graph); (see fig. 5; col 7, lines 29 – 35);
- retrieving the general or detailed information (table) from a database, the general or detailed information being pertinent to the bid line (iconic graph). (see fig. 5; col 7, lines 29 – 35);
- wherein the retrieved general information (table) is provided in a window (table) adjacent the bid line. (see fig. 5; col 7, lines 29 – 35);
- creating a display (table) separate from the graphical visual interface (iconic graph). (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 29 - 35); and
- displaying the detailed information in the separate display (table). (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 29-35);
- wherein the detailed information (table) is rendered in one of text, image, audio, sound, video, graphs and animation. (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 29-35); and
- wherein the information is attribute information (metrics) associated with one bid line (iconic graph). (see fig. 5, col. 7, lines 29-35).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aycock, Light, Jones and Friesen by incorporating

display capabilities, as disclosed by Light, allowing for display of pertinent information for the user.

Regarding Claims 11 – 15, such claims recite substantially similar limitations as claimed in previously rejected claims. Such claim limitations are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as previously utilized.

Regarding Claims 16 – 18, Aycock does not teach a method further comprising the steps of enlarging or reducing a portion of the graphical visual interface; wherein the enlarging or reducing steps show portions of bid lines; nor scrolling the graphical visual interface in a desired direction.

Friesen discloses a method further comprising:

- the steps of enlarging or reducing a portion of the graphical visual interface. (see col. 2, line 51 – col. 3, line 15);
- wherein the enlarging or reducing steps show portions of bid lines. (see col. 2, line 51 – col. 3, line 15); and
- scrolling the graphical visual interface in a desired direction. (see col. 15, lines 13 - 43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Aycock, Light, Jones and Friesen by incorporating display capabilities, as disclosed by Friesen, allowing for display of pertinent information for the user.

Regarding Claims 22 - 30, such claims recite substantially similar limitations as claimed in previously rejected claims. Such claim limitations are therefore rejected using the same art and rationale as previously utilized.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to pending claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JASON M. BORLINGHAUS whose telephone number is (571)272-6924. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday; 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James A. Kramer can be reached on (571)272-6783. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3693

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Jason M Borlinghaus/
Examiner, Art Unit 3693

August 17, 2008